



Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes
January 11, 2024
6:00 PM

1) Call to Order

The meeting was Called to Order by Chairperson Toney.

2) Roll Call of Members

Members present: Ms. Strasser, Mr. Scott, Mr. Heyer, Mr. Hall, Chairperson Toney.

3) Approval of Minutes

It was determined that the Meeting Minutes will be approved at the next meeting.

4) Public Comment

There were no public comments.

5) Old Business

1) Removed from the Agenda

Application Number: BZAP - 23-23

Address: 2200 E Main

Applicant: Ryan Pearson

Owner: Continental Real Estate Cos.

Request: The applicant is seeking design review and a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the redevelopment of the vacant Trinity Lutheran apartment structures at 2160, 2188, & 2186 E Main Street (Parcel No.: 020-000836, 020-000217 & 020-000350). This application was approved with conditions at the December 18, 2024 Board of Zoning and Planning Special Meeting. A condition of approval was the return of the applicant to the ARB to review changes that address the ARB conditions for the building design.

6) New Business

2) Tabled by the Applicant to the February 8, 2024

ARB Application Number: ARB - 23-36

Address: 217 N. Stanwood

Applicant: Anthony Pollina

Owner: Kate Qualmann and Patricio Andrade

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new front porch, a 3-season room, and slate roof modifications.

3) Application Number: ARB- 23-39

Address: 41 N Roosevelt

Applicant: Loftur Kristjansson

Owner: Loftur Kristjansson

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the porch with mudroom and to make facade modifications.

Stan ____ was sworn in.

Ms. Bokor explained this project was caught in progress and it was decided to bring it before the Board so it can be talked through and then handled by Staff.

Ms. Bokor stated the door needs to be changed and she is happy to work with the applicant on the rest of the project.

Ms. Rose indicated this project was discovered by Code Enforcement and shared there are photos included in the application. She mentioned the door and other details that the Board may want to address.

____ shared that the roof and light fixture can be removed if needed; Ms. Bokor said they should be.

____ said the walls are exactly where they were and the layout is the same as to what was present previously but there are walls and windows. There will not be air conditioning or heat.

Mr. Heyer asked if the roof material will match the house; ____ indicated the roof was not touched. The trim around the windows will match the trim around the house.

Mr. Hall did not have any questions.

Ms. Strasser asked about an additional window; Ms. Bokor stated she doesn't feel an additional window is necessary in a mudroom.

The roof color, as it appears in pictures of the prior structure, were discussed. Mr. Scott indicated he was not a fan of the small windows. He also said he appreciated that the project is stepped back from the corner of the building.

Chairperson Toney stated she has nothing to add and reiterated that ____ needs to work

with Ms. Bokor to determine details and submit full plans.

Findings of Fact 17:04

understood the Findings of Fact.

Motion to approve Findings of Fact by Mr. Heyer, second by Ms. Strasser; roll call: Hall–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Strasser–Yes, Scott–Yes, Toney–Yes.

4) Application Number: ARB- 23-40

Address: 2376 Brentwood

Applicant: Pete Foster

Owner: Tracie Stamm

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new covered front porch and other modifications.

Ms. Bokor shared that this application is for the front porch. She explained that Mr. Foster was asked to attend the meeting because the drawings did not contain notes; these have since been added and uploaded.

Mr. Foster was sworn in. He explained the water flow from the current porch and the deteriorating wood shake; he stated the new design goes with a more simplistic design and includes an additional window. He explained the ways the windows and other details will change as a result of the new design.

Ms. Strasser didn't have any comments.

Mr. Scott appreciated the notes and said he thinks this is a good solution with a solid and appropriate design.

Mr. Hall said he thinks the changes are appropriate and he said it makes it look nicer than the current design.

Mr. Heyer asked about the floor material for the porch; it will be concrete and is currently at level with grade. Mr. Foster stated the timber will not be natural in color.

Mr. Scott and Mr. Foster discussed the cedar shake; Mr. Foster said they will do their best to try to match.

Chairperson Toney stated she thinks this looks lovely.

FOF 25:00

**Motion to approve Findings of Fact by Mr. Scott, second by Mr. Hall; roll call:
Scott–Yes, Strasser–Yes, Hall–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

5) Application Number: ARB- 23-41

Address: 213 N Remington

Applicant: Tom Pendery

Owner: Michelle Hogan

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 3rd floor dormer on the (rear) west side of house.

Ms. Bokor stated this application is for a dormer at the rear of the home. She said she feels the window is not the right dimension for this and she would prefer to see the dormer slightly below the ridgeline.

Raymond Perez was sworn in.

Mr. Heyer explained he agreed with Ms. Bokor and discussed framing with trim and bringing the roof to roof intersection down.

Mr. Hall mentioned the small, square windows and said he would like to see the new window mirror these. He is fine with the singular window so long as it matches what is on the house. There was discussion of what fits. Mr. Hall stated he feels a larger window is the right answer.

Ms. Strasser said she is fine with leaving the final design of the window to the Design Consultant so long as it is larger and more consistent with the rest of the house. Lowering the ridgeline was discussed.

Mr. Scott said he thinks the window should not be square and the shape and panel should be repeated to either side.

Mr. Heyer said the important part of the dormer is dividing it into 3 equal panels, and that the center one will have a window. He said the panels do not have to be solid but can be siding or shingle infill and should be trimmed.

Chairperson Toney had nothing to add.

FOF 34:44

**Motion to approve Findings of Fact by Mr. Heyer, second by Ms. Strasser; roll call:
Heyer–Yes, Hall–Yes, Scott–Yes, Strasser–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

6) Application Number: BZAP-23-39 (ARB- 23-43)

Address: 126 S Parkview

Applicant: Jim Sorrell

Owner: James and Kristy Clear

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and a recommendation to BZAP for a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition to the house and an attached trellis and garage.

Ms. Rose said this was originally submitted to the ARB but after speaking with the Zoning attorney regarding the primary vs. accessory structure status, it was determined that this would be considered an accessory structure that exceeds the size of what is allowed in the zoning district. So indicated that therefore, the applicant filed a BZAP application requesting a variance and this will be a recommendation to the Zoning Board. Ms. Rose said the structures are attached, the existing garage will be removed, the walkway will extend out, and the garage will be constructed at that end.

Mr. Hudson was sworn in. He stated the intent of the project is the existing, detached garage and that they are trying to accomplish an open lot. The hope was to not have a variance. The homeowners desire a large garage for equipment, home gym, and writing studio.

Mr. Scott asked if this project was a new build whether or not it would be considered an accessory structure; Ms. Rose stated it would be an accessory structure. He said that square footage aside, he feels the overall scale of the building—especially in the east elevation—feels appropriate but that the roof feels slightly too tall in the north elevation. He gave his opinion that the trellis extension about the garage seems fussy and gave some alternatives. He mentioned continuing the covered walk to a separate entrance for the fitness center. The beam and trellis heights were discussed. Mr. Hudson spoke to the ways the trellis will tie into existing structures, including the membrane roof.

Ms. Strasser asked questions of the applicant; it was confirmed that the stone at the bottom of the garage will be the same as the stone on the house and other details will be mimicked on the garage.

Mr. Hall mentioned the stone details and stated that he is hopeful it can be carried out by the stone on the garage. He requested a desire to better understand the details.

Mr. Heyer cautioned the applicant to ensure the details are worked through with the Design Consultant. He would like to see the details again, and also said he doesn't feel the column spacing has been worked out. He suggested stopping the trellis short of the garage, but Mr. Hudson stated that the intent was to connect it to the house, however now it doesn't need to be. The connection was discussed.

Mr. Scott gave his opinion that the columns are necessary; he said he would feel comfortable cutting back the roof. Mr. Heyer questioned why the cantilevers need to be so tall and stated he feels like these don't fit with the house or garage.

Chairperson Toney asked if there was consideration to making the area a larger rectangle instead of an L shaped design; Mr. Hudson stated this would cover large windows in the existing residence. Mr. Hudson explained the two additions to the back of the house are enclosed. Rain and pooling water was discussed.

Mr. Hall shared his opinion about the stone and stucco and Mr. Heyer asked about details on the garden wall; Mr. Hudson stated details are still being worked out. Mr. Heyer suggested making a recommendation to the BZAP but that the project return to the ARB for further review. Ms. Bokor stated that at this point, she would require that.

Ms. Rose stated the square footage allowed and the overage of the proposed project.

Findings of Fact 1:05:05

Board members, the applicant, and staff discussed the roof plane and materials, including breaking up the roofs.

FOF 1:12:32

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

Details about working with Ms. Bokor and the submittal deadline for updated documents were discussed.

Motion to approve the Findings of Fact by Ms. Stasser, second by Mr. Heyer; roll call: Hall–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Scott–Yes, Strasser–Yes, Toney–Yes.

7) Application Number: BZAP- 23-35

Address: 524 N. Cassady

Applicant: Marianela Portal

Owner: 524-526 N CASSADY AVE LLC

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and a recommendation of a Certificate of Appropriateness to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a conditional use for classroom and party space rental and new signage.

Chairperson Toney noted that the signage is already in place.

Ms. Rose gave a history of this application.

This application was not heard because the applicant was not present.

8) Application Number: BZAP- 23-36

Address: 844 Montrose

Applicant: Jan Wolf

Owner: Jan Wolf

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and a recommendation of a Certificate of Appropriateness to the Board of Zoning and Planning to replace the garage which will require a variance from required setback.

Chairperson Toney stated this is a Consent Agenda item that all Board members reviewed and approved before the meeting.

Ms. Bokor stated the applicant is willing to put a window on Elevation C.

Motion to approve as a Consent Agenda item by Mr. Heyer, second by Mr. Scott; Strasser–Yes, Scott–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Hall–Yes, Toney–Yes.

9) Application Number: BZAP - 23-38

Address: 919 Euclaire

Applicant: Brenda Parker

Owner: Stephen Giebelhaus & Brittany Wirthman

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and a recommendation of a Certificate of Appropriateness to the Board of Zoning and Planning for an addition to the front of the house and a variance from the required side yard setback.

Ms. Bokor explained this project seems conceptually appropriate given how it is cited but there is some concern about how the addition engages with the dormer.

Ms. Parker was sworn in. She explained the history of the home and that the current owners want a foyer and a screen porch. She showcased the proposed foyer, gable, and portico. Ms. Parker explained the challenges given the setback and Ms. Rose spoke to the right of way on the lot.

Mr. Heyer asked about having the roof flat across the front; Ms. Parker explained that the homeowners liked the gable roof. He asked if the applicant would consider making the screen porch stick out further, reducing the mudroom, and having the porch be in line or setback.

Dimensions were discussed.

Mr. Heyer mentioned the gambrel and recession. Proportions were discussed. Mr. Heyer spoke to the home's "clumsy character" but of special interest for so many south Bexley homes.

The applicant stated the home's foundation is a historic block; Ms. Strasser expressed concern that the cultured stone is not appropriate and asked that it be changed. Furthermore, she stated a flat roof would be more appropriate for the home. Ms. Parker said she feels she can procure a close representation of the existing stone. There was discussion about where to place the stone or another material.

Mr. Scott discussed the Hardie board and does not feel it is appropriate on the front of the house; there was further discussion about materials.

Ms. Toney asked about a window; the applicant explained the homeowners do want an extra window. The siding will match. The alignment of the window was discussed.

FOF 1:37:54

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

Motion to approve the Findings of Fact by Ms. Stasser, second by Mr. Hall; roll call: Hall–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Scott–Yes, Strasser–Yes, Toney–Yes.

7) Other Business

8) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned.